

Delegated Report (Members Briefing)		Analysis sheet		Expiry Date:	20/07/2010
		N/A / attached		Consultation Expiry Date:	n/a
Officer			Application Number(s)		
Carlos Martin			2009/2483/P		
Application Address			Drawing Numbers		
24 Grove Terrace London NW5 1PL			Refer to draft decision notice		
PO 3/4	Area Team Signature	C&UD	Authorised Officer Signature		
Proposal(s)					
Details of construction methodology statement for protection of London Plane trees (condition 3) and samples of proposed brickwork/details of capping to raised boundary wall and garage doors (condition 4) pursuant to planning permission dated 23rd May 2009 (ref. 2005/2426/P) (for the erection of a single storey garage and sunroom at the rear of dwellinghouse (Class C3)).					
Recommendation(s):		Grant			
Application Type:		Approval of Details			

Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:	Refer to Draft Decision Notice					
Informatives:						
Consultations						
Adjoining Occupiers:	No. notified	00	No. of responses	01	No. of objections	01
			No. electronic	00		
Summary of consultation responses:	1 objection from neighbour:					
	- Regarding condition 3: (1) The extent of the canopy of the tree appears much greater than what is indicated on the drawing accompanying the Discharge of Conditions application. (2) The work took place and continues with a disregard of protection for the mature plane tree. Officers' response: (1) <i>It is stated that the crown dimensions are not shown correctly on the drawing. However the critical issue is the height between the height of the crown above the ground, which is approximately 5m, which means there is no conflict between the height of the structure and the crown spread of the tree.</i> (2) <i>The submitted drawings show a concrete slab and piles which is the preferred foundation method with regards to the protection of the Plane tree. The objector suggests that a strip foundation has been constructed at least in part. That would be an enforcement matter, which is already being investigated.</i> - Regarding condition 4: (3) The proposed bricks to clad the blockwork walls are slips and not bricks as noted within the original planning application. This change has also resulted in the use of unsightly fibreglass flashings to the tops of the existing party/garden walls and the edge of the roof. Brick slips do not seem appropriate for a structure within the vicinity of Grade II * houses. (4) The inability of the slips to successfully "turn a corner" will be highly detrimental to the overall appearance of the new structure, with the slips acting as "wallpaper". A more appropriate material in the circumstances might be lead - at least the flashings, if also in lead, would be contiguous and their impact would be minimised. (5) The previously approved drawings lack the site context and show an incorrect ground level in the adjoining garden, which has resulted in the building being much taller than expected. The roof overhang and depth is also greater and causes the structure to have more of an impact on neighbouring properties.					

	<p>Officers' response:</p> <p>(3) <i>A sample panel of the brick slips has been submitted to the Council. These are complementary to the original brick boundary wall in terms of their colour, texture and general appearance and are considered acceptable. The brickwork bond is to match that of the existing wall.</i></p> <p>(4) <i>Specially shaped brick slips will be used at the corners of the building so as to ensure the appearance of solid brickwork. Although the brick slips may be slightly more regular in their alignment than a traditionally constructed wall, the overall difference in elevational appearance will be marginal. The sample provided has weatherstruck pointing. However, this has been requested to be changed to a more traditional flush or slightly recessed joint using a lime rich mortar, which has been agreed by the applicants in writing along with applying lead to flashings protecting the original garden walls.</i></p> <p>(5) <i>Previously approved drawings fall outside the scope of the current application for approval of details. Any departure of the approved scheme is a matter for the current enforcement investigation to solve.</i></p>
<p>CAAC/Local groups* comments: *Please Specify</p>	n/a

Site Description

No 24 Grove Terrace is one of a terrace of 22 houses built in c1780-93. The houses are flat fronted in brown brick with rusticated stucco ground floors, they are of 3 storeys with attics and are listed grade II* and are in the Dartmouth Park Conservation Area.

Relevant History

2005/2426/P & 2005/2429/L: planning permission and listed building consent **granted** for the erection of a single storey garage and sunroom at the rear of dwelling house (Class C3).

EN10/0425: enforcement investigation opened with regards to the above permission.

Relevant policies

Replacement Unitary Development Plan 2006

SD6 – Amenity for occupiers and neighbours

B1 – General design principles

B3 – Alterations and extensions

B6 – Listed buildings

B7 – Conservation areas

N8- trees

Camden Planning Guidance 2006

10 - Conservation areas

19 – Extensions, alterations and conservatories

Camden Square Conservation Area Statement

LDF Core Strategy and Development Policies

As the draft LDF Core Strategy and Development Policies documents have now been published, they are material planning considerations. However, as a matter of law, limited weight should be attached to them at this stage.

DP26 – Managing the impact of development on occupiers and neighbours

CS14 – Promoting high quality places and conserving our heritage

DP25 – Conserving Camden's Heritage

Assessment

Approval of details is sought in respect of construction methodology statement for protection of London Plane trees (condition 3) and samples of proposed brickwork/details of capping to raised boundary wall and garage doors (condition 4) pursuant to planning permission dated 23rd May 2009 (ref. 2005/2426/P) for the erection of a single storey garage and sunroom at the rear of dwellinghouse (Class C3).

Condition 3:

A construction methodology statement for the protection of the London Plane tree shall be submitted including details of the excavation for the steel framework and any other excavations on site in so far as these items may affect trees on or adjoining the site, shall be submitted to and approved by the Council as the local planning authority before any works on site are commenced.

The submitted details are essentially related to the provision of a raft foundation supported by piles. These details are considered to be satisfactory.

Condition 4:

Samples of the proposed brickwork and drawings at 1:20 showing the proposed capping to the raised boundary wall and proposed details at 1:20 of the garage doors shall not be otherwise than as shall have been submitted to and approved by the local planning authority before any work is commenced on the relevant part of the development. These parts of the development shall not be carried out otherwise than in accordance with the details thus approved.

The submitted drawings indicate that brick slips rather than full bricks are to be used as the cladding material. A sample panel has been provided and is considered acceptable. However, the sample submitted has weatherstruck pointing which is overly harsh and modern in its appearance. A more traditional flush or slightly recessed joint instead, as well as a lime rich mix so as to improve the overall appearance of the wall, would be more appropriate. Applicants have agreed to this in writing.

The submitted drawings also indicate the use of lead flashings, which is in line with the approved scheme. An alternative proprietary flashing system has been used which does not have the appearance of traditional lead and is not considered acceptable. So as to retain the integrity of the overall design of the building, particularly given its location within the curtilage of a Grade II* listed building, lead is required. This issue will need to be taken forward by Enforcement who are already investigating reports that the building has not been built in accordance with the approved drawings.

The proposed garage door has been viewed on site and is a metal up and over unit - proprietary up and over door was approved. This is now to have a vertical, rather than a horizontal, planked design, which is considered acceptable.

Recommendation: Approve details

DISCLAIMER

Decision route to be decided by nominated members on Monday 28th June 2010. For further information see

<http://www.camden.gov.uk/ccm/navigation/environment/planning-and-built-environment/planning-applications/development-control-members-briefing/>